REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-14 and 16-18 are pending and rejected. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-14 and 16-18 are objected to. Claims 3, 9, and 15 were previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 7, and 13 are amended.

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-14 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-14 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horvitz et al., (hereinafter "Horvitz"), US Pub. No. 2007/0011314, in view of Foladare et al., (hereinafter "Foladare"), US Pat. No. 6,311,210 and Singh, US Pat. No. 6,405,035.

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejections, Applicants submit the amendments to claims 1, 7, and 13 overcome the rejection and render the rejection moot. The rejection should be withdrawn.

With regard to the § 103 rejection of claim 1, Applicants submit the cited references do not teach or suggest at least a method for forwarding messages, comprising, among other things storing in a trend analysis table results of the statistical trend analysis performed, wherein said results are stored in order of probability from highest to lowest and transferring incoming messages based on a location in the trend analysis table with the highest probability of contacting the user and user location preferences based on the message source (*e.g.*, as described in claim 1).

The Office Action asserts Horvitz teaches the relevant limitations, citing paragraphs [0063], [0079], and [0080]. *See* Office Action dated 8/11/2009, page 6. Applicants disagree.

With regard to paragraph [0063], the Office Action further asserts: "User context store can be edited and modified by user". The relevant portion of paragraph [0063] to which the

Office Action is presumably referring is: "The user context module 304 determines a user's current context, based on the context information sources 306 as published to the whiteboard 307; the user context profile store 305 stores the context parameters for a user, such as the default context settings for the user, which can be edited and modified by the user." The relevant section describes that a user may edit and modify context parameters. The term "context parameter" is only mentioned this once through out the application, and is not further explained anywhere. However, paragraph [0069] describes "parameters" used for the notification source scheme generally, which include message class, relevance, importance, novelty, content attributes, and others. Regardless, Applicants submit, as is understood by one of skill in the art, editing and modifying a generic "parameter" to facilitate message transactions is not the same as a trend analysis table further comprises a user override location that indicates probabilities of successful contact for each location are to be ignored and the override location is to be used for contact (*e.g.*, as described in claim 1). Moreover, the cited section does not teach or suggest storing in a trend analysis table the result of the statistical trend analysis performed, wherein said results are stored in order of probability from highest to lowest, and if a first transfer attempt is unsuccessful, transferring to a next highest probability contact point for the user at all.

Paragraph [0055] fails to support a proper rejection for similar reasons as well. In particular, paragraph [0055] describes accessing a user profile to indicate, for example, a time the user prefers via a pager but only if the notification has a predetermined importance level. Applicants submit, as is understood by one of skill in the art, accessing a "time" information parameter found in user profile to determine an acceptable time and manner of contact is not the same as a trend analysis table further comprises a user override location that indicates

probabilities of successful contact for each location are to be ignored and the override location is to be used for contact. *See* also paragraphs [0007], [0008]. Again, the cited section does not teach or suggest storing in a trend analysis table the result of the statistical trend analysis performed, wherein said results are stored in order of probability from highest to lowest, and if a first transfer attempt is unsuccessful, transferring to a next highest probability contact point for the user at all.

The description in paragraphs [0079] and [0080] fail to teach or suggest at least the relevant limitations for similar reasons also. Paragraphs [0079] (steps 500-504) and [0080] (steps 508-510) are directed to a method employing the notification architecture embodiments of Horvitz. They do not describe, for example, a user override location that indicates probabilities of successful contact for each location are to be ignored and the override location (*i.e.*, "a prefer contact location") is to be used for contact, and indeed overrides (even generally) anywhere. Also, the cited section does not teach or suggest storing in a trend analysis table the result of the statistical trend analysis performed, wherein said results are stored in order of probability from highest to lowest, and if a first transfer attempt is unsuccessful, transferring to a next highest probability contact point for the user at all. Applicants submit the Horvitz reference as a whole, including the cited sections, fails to teach or suggest the relevant limitations for similar reasons to those described above.

Finally, Applicants submit the cited reference fails to teach or suggest transferring incoming messages based on user location preferences based on the message source as well. The cited reference, including the sections discussed above, does not describe such features

anywhere. Applicants respectfully submit the current rejection is lacking, and request withdrawal.

To make up for the deficiencies of Horvitz, the Office Action cites to column 5, lines 13-16 and column 6, lines 3-17 of Singh. *See* Office Action dated 8/11/2009, page 3. Applicants submit the cited section fails to teach or suggest the relevant limitations. Column 5, lines 13-16 merely describes the host server 10 ranking each devices 16 to determine a probability of receipt by the subscriber. Column 6, lines 3-17 describe delivering the message the highest ranked device, and if not accessed, sending the message to the next-ranked device. It does not describe, for example and at least, transferring incoming messages based on user location preferences, wherein said user location preference are based on the message source (*e.g.*, as described in claim 1).

Foladare also fails to make up for the deficiencies of Horvitz. Foladere is directed to sending email to a receiving party by utilizing a profile information from profile database. However, it does not describe at least a trend analysis table further comprises a user override location that indicates probabilities of successful contact for each location are to be ignored and the override location is to be used for contact.

Therefore, since for at least the reasons described above, none of the cited references teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 1, the rejection is lacking and should be withdrawn. Applicants submit claim 1 is allowable, and independent claims 7 and 13 are allowable for similar reasons. Claims 2, 4-6, 8, 10-12, 14, and 16-18 are allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim.

It is believed that this Amendment places the application in condition for allowance, and early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Date: October 13, 2009

By: /Sumit Bhattacharya/
    Sumit Bhattacharya
    (Reg. No. 51,469)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7500